DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 774 HE 019 017

TITLE	Achieving Reasonable Campus Security. Self-Regulation Initiatives: Resource Documents for Colleges and Universities, No. 2.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 85
NOTE	6p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Campuses; *College Housing; *Crime Prevention; Dormitories; Guidelines; Higher Education; Information Needs; Law Enforcement; Police School Relationship; Resident Assistants; *School Security; *Security Personnel; *Violence

ABSTRACT

Steps colleges can take to minimize the likelihood of violent crime on campuses are recommended, and administrative responsibilities are identified. Important basics are to inform campus members about security risks and about procedures for summoning aid during an emergency. While attending to educational values, colleges should consider whether access of uninvited visitors to campus should be restricted or monitored. With security in mind, each college should periodically examine its grounds-keeping standards and the adequacy of outdoor lighting and ensure that access to master keys is restricted. A campus with grounds as well as buildings should consider having an escort or shuttle service. Colleges offering on- or off-campus housing to undergraduates should provide some form of supervision within student housing on security issues. A related concern is providing training for student-housing supervisors responsible for safeguarding security. Training for security officers and procedures for communicating complaints about the performance of officers are also needed. If security officers are authorized to carry guns or chemical restraints, additional policies and procedures are required. An established pattern of communications and relations with the local police is important. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SELF-REGULATION INITIATIVES:

RESOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

No. 2
December, 1985

ACHIEVING REASONABLE CAMPUS SECURITY

ED265774

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE019 017

Self-Regulation Initiatives: Resource Documents for Colleges and Universities

No. 2
December, 1985

Achieving Reasonable Campus Security

This statement was developed by the ACE Advisory Committee on Self-Regulation Initiatives and endorsed at its October, 1985 meeting. The Executive Committee of the American College Personel Association also endorsed the document in July, 1985. ACE Board Chair: **Philip H. Jordan, Jr., President Kenyon College; ACE President: Robert H. Atwell.**

There is ample evidence today of increasing violent crime on the nation's campuses. Students, faculty, and staff alike have been victims. The processes of discovering and transmitting knowledge may also suffer if, in response to this crisis, academic traditions of free movement and access are restricted. On the one hand, institutions need to make their campuses reasonably secure places for all members of their community. On the other hand, there are demonstrable tensions between an ideal academic environment and a completely secure campus. It is essential to work for an equitable balance between an open environment where academic inquiry can thrive and a safe environment where inquirers can feel secure. The concepts of reasonable security and of administrative responsibility provide direction in achieving this balance.

The Concept of Reasonable Security

Each institution should review periodically its efforts to make its campus a reasonably secure place for all members of its community. It should marshal those forces within its control so as to provide that its students and employees are able to enjoy on campus at least that average degree of security enjoyed by similarly situated citizens of the surrounding community. The concept of "reasonable security" recognizes that there are demonstrable tensions between an ideal academic environment and a secure campus. The concept also recognizes that the risk of becoming a campus victim of violent crime must vary by factors such as the crime rate in the surrounding community.

Administrative Responsibility

Administrative responsibility for campus security should be assigned to specific officials. Each institution should also designate responsible individuals to be on call to respond to security emergencies. Responsibility for the campus security system includes the need to ensure the following:

1) Security needs are taken into account in the design, maintenance and operation of the institution's buildings, grounds, and equipment;
2) students and other members of the institutional community are adequately informed about security risks and procedures;
3) security personnel are adequately screened, trained, equipped, and supervised by the institution or its contractor;
4) the number of security personnel utilized is adequate to perform the functions assigned to the department. If no security personnel are utilized, the campus should be made reasonably secure by other means.
5) data regarding security incidents are collected and receive periodic administrative review.

Suggested Practices

The suggestions which follow enumerate some specific steps institutions can take to minimize the likelihood of violent crime. The rich diversity of the nation's institutions of higher education works against any simple or complete enumeration. Urban and rural institutions usually enjoy quite different situations respecting the prospects of violent crime, as is also often the case with residential and commuting campuses. Each institution will naturally assess its needs in light of its unique circumstances, characteristics, and resources. The suggested practices should be adopted and adapted as appropriate.

I. Instructing Campus Community about Security Procedures

1) Each institution should provide all campus members information about security risks and precautions applicable to areas of the campus they may frequent.

2) Each institution should inform all members of the campus community about procedures for summoning aid in the event of a security emergency.

3) The campus community should be informed of the importance of reporting all criminal incidents immediately.

It may be appropriate to disseminate security information that is tailored to the activities of specific sub-groups of the campus community, such as commuting students, resident students, and night-shift employees.

II. Grounds Security and Access

With careful attention to the primacy of educational values, institutions should consider whether it is feasible and advisable to restrict or monitor access of uninvited visitors to their campus. Such a determination should take into account the degree of any security risk posed by the presence of visitors on the campus. The size and physical lay-out of the campus and the extent to which institutional activities draw large numbers of outside visitors should also be considered. Decisions whether to restrict access to campus buildings by visitors or to monitor such access should take into account the security risks existing in the neighborhood of the building, the effect of restriction on the academic value of the facility, the physical lay-out of the building, the hours during which significant numbers of campus community members are present in the building, and the degree to which permitting outsiders access to such buildings furthers institutional interests.

The great majority of campuses are not surrounded by a fence or wall designed to keep the outside world from entering. In general, creating higher education campuses with security barriers is incompatible with their educational function. However, some enhancements of campus security can be achieved by restricting and monitoring access to campus grounds. For instance, the lay-out of an institution may make it feasible to monitor traffic entering the campus, or to fence specific areas considered to pose substantial security risks.

1) **Grounds Maintenance.** Each institution should periodically examine its grounds-keeping standards from a security point of view. It should evaluate building entrances, parking areas, outdoor communication facilities and major campus pathways with respect to plant growth and debris that may materially detract from security.

2) **Adequacy of Outdoor Lighting.**

a) Each institution should periodically review the adequacy of its outdoor campus lighting from a security point of view.

b) All authorized entrances to student housing buildings should be sufficiently illuminated after dusk to permit observation of persons loitering in the vicinity. Lighting should be distributed about the rest of the campus to cover building entrances, pathways, parking facilities, and other open areas where students must travel after dusk.

c) Each institution should systematically monitor the operation of outdoor lighting. The light-monitoring system should include a program to replace defective or burnt-out lights as soon as practicable after being reported.

3) **Master-Key Control.** Each institution should maintain and document adequate procedures to ensure that access to master keys is restricted. Master keys should be issued only in circumstances of clearly defined need.

4) **Escort Service.** An institution whose campus consists of grounds as well as buildings should consider having an escort or shuttle service as necessary. Students should be warned against walking in risky areas alone after dark and should be informed of the availablity of the escort service.

III. Supervision in Student Housing

Many institutions use non-students or graduate students to supervise undergraduate housing, often in conjunction with specially selected undergraduates. Where undergraduates are the sole supervisory presence, they should be upperclassmen in good academic standing and should be screened for maturity and judgment. Student housing supervisors should be recognized as an integral part of a campus' security system and trained accordingly.

1) An institution offering on- or off-campus housing to undergraduates should provide some form of supervision within student housing on matters affecting the security of the residents.

2) Each institution should recognize the extent student-housing supervisors are in fact responsible for safeguarding security in student housing and should provide them with training commensurate with such responsibility.

3) Individual institutions with resident students should assess the feasibility and desirability of having and enforcing rules restricting the access of non-residents to student housing.

4) An institution with resident students should make reasonable efforts to ensure that all resident students are adequately informed about security procedures and rules applicable to their residence halls and that each resident student is instructed how to react and how to seek aid if an unauthorized persons obtain access to student housing.

IV. Training Security Officers

1) An institution that maintains or contracts for a security force should provide that its officers receive training commensurate with their functions and such training should be maintained on a current basis.

2) An institution maintaining a security force should have procedures for disciplining officers who fail to perform their duties.

3) An institution contracting for security personnel should have documented procedures for communicating complaints about the performance of officers to the contractor.

V. Campus Law Enforcement

1) An institution should have an established pattern of communications and relations with the local police. It may be advisable to develop a formal agreement with the local police department, spelling out the respective jurisdictions of each and the circumstances in which they are to assist on security matters.

2) An institution that does not have security officers with the authority to make criminal arrests should establish a rapid and effective means of communicating security emergencies to local police or other back-up security personnel with arrest powers.

3) If security officers are authorized to carry guns or chemical restraints, the institution should establish that:

   a) weapons are carried only by officers satisfying legal requirements,

   b) officers' qualifications for carrying such weapons are reviewed periodically.

   c) strictly enforced procedures govern the securing of such weapons when officers are off duty, and

   d) a clear written policy governs the use of such weapons.

4) An institution may employ students in part-time security patrol jobs whereby such students are supervised by responsible members of the security department. Students employed in such jobs should be instructed not to engage in confrontation with anyone they suspect of wrong-doing; a security officer or the local police should be summoned.

5) An institution sponsoring special events, such that it can reasonably anticipate that its regular security force will not be adequate, should retain supplemental security service. The institution should define the duties of such personnel so that all necessary security functions are covered.

Additional Resources

Departmental Self-Study: A Guide for Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, Max Bromley and Leonard Territo. Hartford: International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, 1984.

Report on Current Security Practices and Policies Among AICUM Institutions. The Community Security Standards Committee, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts, 1984. The AICUM report served as the origin of this Resource Document; portions of the AICUM report are incorporated herein.

This statement is the second in the series "Resource Documents" designed to complement the Self-Regulation "Guidelines" series. Statements in the "Resource Documents" series are constructed to provide self-regulatory assistance on various issues of differing institutional concern and commonality. Documents in this series, as with those in the broader-based "Guidelines" series, provide suggestions of good practice which can be adapted to the specific circumstances of each college and university.

The documents are not copyrighted and may be reproduced in the interest of education. Permission for resale, reprinting, or commercial use should be requested in advance from ACE's Publications Department.

For further information, contact John B. Bennett, Director, Office on Self-Regulation Initiatives (202) 939-9412. Additional copies of this statement may be obtained upon request. Please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036